

Appl. No. 10/618,308  
Amdt. dated 2 October 2004  
Reply to Office Action of 07 June 2004

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

#### **Rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C 102(b)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-9 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morlok (US 6,056,002). In such rejection the Examiner has noted disclosures of Morlok alleged to disclose applicant's claimed invention. Such rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that there is no teaching or suggestion in Morlok of the structure or function of applicant's invention as recited in the herein amended claims.

The invention of Morlock discloses an enclosure for sanitary plumbing wherein the disclosure relates almost entirely to the structure of the foam encapsulated module 10. As to pertinent structure of the plumbing arrangement of Morlock, his disclosure only discloses first and second parallel water conduit portions, one hot and one cold, each having a meter and shut-off valve arranged in the same plane and at the same height. This arrangement is for the purpose of facilitating the convenient encapsulation of the conduit portions with no other advantage or reason therefore disclosed. In fact, the claims only recite "wherein one shut-off device (18) and one meter base (20) is provided at mutually corresponding positions in each conduit portion (14)". The remainder of claim recitations relate only to the manufacture and attachment of the module 10. It is thus clear that the teachings of Morlock are pertinent only as to the structure of the module 10 with no teaching relating to applicant's invention other than the unitary encapsulation within the module 10. There is no teaching or suggestion of the meter electronic readouts and computer processing of data as disclosed and variously claimed, directly or indirectly, in applicant's invention.

Claims 1, 4-9 and 14-20 remain in the application, all of which except for claim 19 being amended herein and submitted as reciting structure and function not taught or suggested in the disclosure of Morlok. Claims 2, 3 and 10-13 have been canceled. The courts have held under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) that "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art disclosure of all of a

